arXiv:1406.7713v2 [gr-qc] 28 Aug 2014

Preprint

Absence of cosmological constant problem in special relativistic field theory of gravity

Carlos Barceló,[a] **Raúl Carballo-Rubio,**[a] **and Luis J. Garay**[b,c]

[a] *Instituto de Astrofísica de Andalucía (IAA-CSIC), Glorieta de la Astronomía, 18008 Granada, Spain*

[b] *Departamento de Física Teórica II, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain*

[c] *Instituto de Estructura de la Materia (IEM-CSIC), Serrano 121, 28006 Madrid, Spain*

E-mail: carlos@iaa.es, raulc@iaa.es, luisj.garay@ucm.es

Abstract: The principles of quantum field theory in flat spacetime suggest that gravity is mediated by a massless particle with helicity ± 2, the so-called graviton. It is regarded as textbook knowledge that, when the self-coupling of a particle with these properties is considered, the long-wavelength structure of such a nonlinear theory is fixed to be that of general relativity. However, here we show that these arguments conceal an implicit assumption which is surreptitiously motivated by the very knowledge of general relativity. This is shown by providing a counterexample: we revisit a nonlinear theory of gravity which is not structurally equivalent to general relativity and that, in the non-interacting limit, describes a free helicity ± 2 graviton. We explicitly prove that this theory can be understood as the result of self-coupling in complete parallelism to the well-known case of general relativity. The assumption which was seen as natural in previous analyses but biased the result is pointed out. This special relativistic field theory of gravity implies the decoupling of vacuum zero-point energies of matter and passes all the known experimental tests in gravitation.

Keywords: graviton; self-coupling; cosmological constant; vacuum energy; unimodular gravity; emergent gravity

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Self-coupling of a helicity ±2 graviton **2**

3 A low-energy solution to the cosmological constant problem **7**

4 Summary **8**

Contents

1 Introduction

The fact that vacuum zero-point energies of matter do not gravitate can be considered as the only available glance to the realm of quantum gravity with which we have been experimentally rewarded up to now. However, the application of effective field theory arguments to the combination of general relativity and the standard model of particle physics makes think that what is reasonable from the theoretical perspective is, indeed, the contrary [1, 2]. Finding a mechanism which can forbid these energies to gravitate, while keeping intact the low-energy physics as to pass the stringent experimental tests on deviations from general relativity, is what is usually known as the cosmological constant problem [1–3].[1]

The mainstream school of thought is that this problem would be solved in the framework of a consistent theory of quantum gravity. It is also common the theoretical expectation that the would-be theory of quantum gravity should lead exactly to general relativity in the long-wavelength limit [4]. This motivates the search of different mechanisms which can avoid the cosmological constant problem while keeping the structure of general relativity intact. After a long search there is no compelling model and, moreover, they usually involve unknown physics [2]. With a totally different spirit, here we argue that there exists a solution to the cosmological constant problem which only rests on the well-settled principles of quantum field theory in flat spacetime, with the proposal that gravity is mediated by a helicity ±2 graviton, and the equivalence principle as reformulated by Weinberg [5].

In this work we point out that there is a loophole in the chain of arguments which assert that general relativity is the only possible consistent theory of a self-interacting helicity ±2 graviton. This is not an academic question but has nontrivial consequences: there exists an alternative nonlinear theory of gravity which can be understood as the result of the self-coupling of such a particle as well. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first time

[1] Here we do not address the issue of determining the actual value of the cosmological constant by means of first-principles calculations, but to alleviate this tension.

that this has been solidly argued. This theory is similar in spirit to unimodular gravity and it is denominated Weyl transverse gravity [6] (indeed, the former can be obtained through proper gauge fixing in the latter theory). The interpretation of its nonlinear character as the result of self-coupling makes this theory a legitimate candidate to describe the long-wavelength limit of the would-be theory of quantum gravity. This position is strengthened by the fact that it solves the cosmological constant problem: vacuum zero-point energies of matter do not gravitate, while the rest of phenomenology of general relativity and the standard model is respected.[2]

What makes this proposal attractive is that it involves only natural assumptions in the framework of quantum field theory. One could have reached it without previous knowledge of general relativity. In fact, being accustomed to the geometric description of gravity even hinders its obtention: as we point out, this prior knowledge caused previous approaches such as [7, 8] to pass over this theory. The lesson is that the issue of vacuum zero-point energies is no longer a problem if one takes the principles of quantum mechanics and special relativity seriously and consider general relativity only as a low-energy effective theory. This raises interesting thoughts about the underlying principles in current approaches to the construction of a theory of quantum gravity.

A few sentences are in order to properly place this paper with respect to previous work in the subject. It represents a continuation of the research reported in [9], where it was shown for the first time that unimodular gravity can be obtained as a solution to the self-coupling problem. To reach this result we had, however, to consider a constrained graviton field from the beginning of the construction. For this reason the reader could get the impression that it is really the imposition of this constraint what it is behind of the obtention of unimodular gravity, making this solution still marginal with respect of general relativity. The content of this paper shows that this impression is not correct and conveniently merges the results of [9] and [6, 10]. We do not discuss here the legitimation of the entire construction from the point of view of special relativity and particle physics, which is thoroughly covered in [9]. The new mathematical result we present, namely the obtention of Weyl transverse gravity as the result of graviton self-coupling, is not the only contribution of the paper, but also the conceptual synthesis and the consequences that follow for a broader emergent gravity program.

Notation.– We use the metric convention $(-,+,+,+)$. Curvature-related quantities will be defined following Misner-Thorne-Wheeler's convention [11]. When the Minkowski metric η_{ab} is used, it is understood as written in a generic coordinate system. The covariant derivative ∇ is always related to the flat metric and $\mathrm{d}\mathscr{V}$ is the Minkowski volume element.

2 Self-coupling of a helicity ± 2 graviton

Within the classification of fundamental interactions in terms of the unitary representations of the Poincaré group [12], gravity is expected to be mediated by a particle corresponding to the massless spin-2 representation. The massless character of the representation means

[2] Contrary to other proposals which imply constraints on the matter sector [2].

that only the states with helicity ± 2 are physical. This representation has a direct on-shell implementation in field theory [13]: a second-rank symmetric tensor field h^{ab} which satisfies the equations of motion

$$\Box h^{ab} = 0, \tag{2.1}$$

as well as the constraints

$$\eta_{ab} h^{ab} = 0, \qquad \nabla_b h^{ab} = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

In fact, the physical objects are equivalence classes of h^{ab} defined by the equivalence relation

$$h'^{ab} \sim h^{ab}, \qquad h'^{ab} = h^{ab} + \eta^{ac}\nabla_c \xi^b + \eta^{bc}\nabla_c \xi^a, \tag{2.3}$$

where the generators ξ^a satisfy

$$\nabla_a \xi^a = 0, \qquad \Box \xi^a = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

One can see that there always exists a generator ξ^a such that the states with helicities $\sigma = 0, \pm 1$ are gauged away (for example, in light-cone gauge [14]). On the other hand, the constraints (2.2) in the definition of the field h^{ab} can be thought as the elimination of the scalar and vector representations of the Poincaré group (see Appendix I in [15]).

Let us stress that this on-shell description is the only firm statement one can draw from the assumption that gravity is mediated by a helicity ± 2 graviton only, with no admixture of spin 1 or 0. One can take this description as the basis to discuss the self-coupling problem [9], although this procedure has some (tractable) drawbacks which can be avoided by slightly modifying the starting point. The usual way to proceed is to relax the conditions (2.2) as well as (2.4) thus enlarging the gauge symmetry, which leads to the well-known Fierz-Pauli theory. This theory has (2.3) as internal gauge invariance, now with no restrictions on the generators. However, it is remarkable that there exists an alternative extension which also reduces on-shell to a helicity ± 2 graviton, which is called Weyl transverse theory [6]. As the name suggests, the internal gauge symmetry of the theory is given by

$$h'^{ab} \sim h^{ab}, \qquad h'^{ab} = h^{ab} + \eta^{ac}\nabla_c \xi^b + \eta^{bc}\nabla_c \xi^a + \phi \eta^{ab}, \tag{2.5}$$

with generators satisfying only the first condition in (2.4), that is $\nabla_a \xi^a = 0$, and ϕ is an arbitrary scalar function. The action of this theory is given by:

$$\mathscr{A}_0 := \frac{1}{4}\int \mathrm{d}\mathscr{V} \left[2\eta_{bj}\delta^a_k \delta^i_c - \eta^{ai}\eta_{bj}\eta_{ck} - \eta_{bc}\delta^a_k \delta^i_j + \frac{3}{8}\eta^{ai}\eta_{bc}\eta_{jk}\right] \nabla_a h^{bc} \nabla_i h^{jk}. \tag{2.6}$$

Fierz-Pauli theory and Weyl transverse theory are the only two linear extensions compatible with the on-shell description of gravitons given above [6]. This fact alone is interesting enough to explore this last theory to its ultimate consequences. Even if both are by construction completely equivalent as linear theories, their nonlinear completions could substantially differ.

If we want to describe gravity we need to couple these theories to matter. Nowadays it is well understood that this coupling will be through the stress-energy tensor, implying

that the resulting theory would be nonlinear [13]. Let us write the resulting action of the self-coupling procedure as

$$\mathscr{A} := \mathscr{A}_0 + \mathscr{A}_{\rm I}, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\mathscr{A}_0$ is the free part and $\mathscr{A}_{\rm I}$ is the self-interacting part we are going to solve for. Given this action, one would be able to obtain its stress-energy tensor. $\mathscr{A}_{\rm I}$ is then fixed by the requeriment of leading to this stress-energy tensor (obtained by Hilbert's prescription) as the source of the equations of motion:

$$\frac{\delta \mathscr{A}_{\rm I}}{\delta h^{ab}} = \lambda \lim_{\gamma\to\eta} \frac{\delta(\mathscr{A}_0 + \mathscr{A}_{\rm I})}{\delta \gamma^{ab}}. \tag{2.8}$$

Here λ is the coupling constant. One just needs to expand $\mathscr{A}_{\rm I} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda^n \mathscr{A}_n$ and compare different orders in the coupling constant λ to obtain the set of iterative equations of the self-coupling problem [16]:

$$\frac{\delta \mathscr{A}_n}{\delta h^{ab}} = \lim_{\gamma\to\eta} \frac{\delta \mathscr{A}_{n-1}}{\delta \gamma^{ab}}, \qquad n \geq 1. \tag{2.9}$$

Notice that to obtain the right-hand side of these equations one needs to write the partial actions $\mathscr{A}_n$ in terms of an auxiliary metric γ_{ab}. In this procedure different choices can be made in the form of non-minimal couplings to the auxiliary metric [9].

It can be seen that general relativity is a solution to these iterative equations leading, at the lowest order, to Fierz-Pauli theory [7, 9, 17]. In the following, we are going to find the nonlinear theory which satisfies the iterative equations of the self-coupling problem (2.9) and, at the lowest order, reduces to Weyl transverse theory (2.6).

Let us start with a nonlinear action motivated by unimodular gravity:

$$\mathscr{A} := \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \int \mathrm{d}\mathscr{V} R(\hat{g}), \tag{2.10}$$

where $R(\hat{g})$ has the same functional form as the Ricci scalar of a metric $\hat{g}_{ab}$ whose determinant is constrained by the condition $\det(\hat{g}) = \det(\eta)$. However, for us $\hat{g}_{ab}$ is just a tensor field which lives in a flat background. To make this explicit, let us use the well-known fact [18] that one can express the Ricci scalar in terms of the covariant derivatives associated with the flat metric η_{ab}, denoted by ∇, and integrate by parts to put the action in the form:

$$\mathscr{A} = \frac{1}{4\lambda^2} \int \mathrm{d}\mathscr{V} \left[2\hat{g}_{bj}\delta^a_k\delta^i_c - \hat{g}^{ai}\hat{g}_{bj}\hat{g}_{ck}\right] \nabla_a \hat{g}^{bc} \nabla_i \hat{g}^{jk}. \tag{2.11}$$

Written in this form, it is clear that it describes a special relativistic field theory, albeit nonlinear [compare this expression with (2.6)]. The covariant notation we are using makes clear that this theory is invariant under general coordinate transformations. Moreover, by construction this action is invariant under transverse diffeomorphisms, whose infinitesimal form is

$$\delta_\xi \hat{g}^{ab} := \mathcal{L}_\xi \hat{g}^{ab}, \qquad \nabla_a \xi^a = 0. \tag{2.12}$$

These are the nonlinear version of the linear symmetry (2.3) with transverse generators. The respective nonlinear deformation of the remaining symmetry of the Weyl transverse theory are conformal transformations. To include these let us define

$$\hat{g}_{ab} := \kappa^{-1/4} g_{ab}. \tag{2.13}$$

Here $\kappa := \det(g)/\det(\eta)$. This definition makes the action automatically invariant under conformal transformations, whose infinitesimal version is

$$\delta_\omega g_{ab} := \delta\omega \, g_{ab}. \tag{2.14}$$

Written in terms of g_{ab} the action is given by:

$$\mathscr{A} = \frac{1}{4\lambda^2}\int \mathrm{d}\mathscr{V}\, \kappa^{1/4}\Big\{[2g_{bj}\delta^a_k\delta^i_c - g^{ai}g_{bj}g_{ck}]\nabla_a g^{bc}\nabla_i g^{jk} + \\ + \frac{1}{\kappa}\delta^a_b\delta^i_c\nabla_a g^{bc}\nabla_i\kappa - \frac{1}{2\kappa}g^{ai}g_{bc}\nabla_a g^{bc}\nabla_i\kappa - \frac{1}{8\kappa^2}g^{ai}\nabla_a\kappa\nabla_i\kappa\Big\}. \tag{2.15}$$

One can see that the transformations (2.12) and (2.14) combine in a way that makes this action invariant under transverse diffeomorphisms (now acting on the field g_{ab}) as well as conformal transformations. The action (2.15) is thus the most general nonlinear covariant action quadratic in the derivatives of the field g_{ab} and satisfying these invariance requisites.

Now we are going to show that this nonlinear theory can be obtained via self-coupling of a helicity ± 2 graviton described by the action of Weyl transverse theory (2.6). To do that, we shall extend the formalism in [17], which was useful to prove the analogue result in the case of general relativity in a second order formalism, to consider actions of the type:

$$\frac{1}{4\lambda^2}\int \mathrm{d}\mathscr{V}\, \Big[M^{ai}{}_{bcjk}(g,\eta)\nabla_a g^{bc}\nabla_i g^{jk} + \\ + N^{ai}{}_{bc}(g,\eta)\nabla_a g^{bc}\nabla_i\kappa + O(g,\eta)g^{ai}\nabla_a\kappa\nabla_i\kappa\Big]. \tag{2.16}$$

If we perform an expansion $g^{ab} := \gamma^{ab} + \lambda h^{ab}$, then this action is by construction a solution of the iterative equations and the leading order is given by the first functional derivative of this action which does not vanish in the flat limit $\gamma_{ab} \to \eta_{ab}$. In this case, it is the second order contribution which in the flat limit reads:

$$\frac{1}{4}\int \mathrm{d}\mathscr{V}\, \Big[M^{ai}{}_{bcjk}(\eta,\eta)\nabla_a h^{bc}\nabla_i h^{jk} - \\ - N^{ai}{}_{bc}(\eta,\eta)\eta_{jk}\nabla_a h^{bc}\nabla_i h^{jk} + O(\eta,\eta)\eta^{ai}\eta_{bc}\eta_{jk}\nabla_a h^{bc}\nabla_i h^{jk}\Big]. \tag{2.17}$$

The expression of this first nontrivial order in terms of a general auxiliary metric γ_{ab} gives the non-minimal couplings which are necessary to the consistency of the formalism and, thus, the source to which the field h^{ab} couples at first order: the traceless stress-energy tensor. Higher orders can be directly evaluated from that expression of the first order to construct the infinite series of partial actions $\{\mathscr{A}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and the corresponding sources. In other words, one only needs to know the form of the free action and the source to which the

graviton couples at first order to construct the entire series, thus justifying the constructive character of the self-coupling procedure.

The action (2.15) we want to consider is a particular case of (2.16) with

$$\begin{aligned} M^{ai}{}_{bcjk}(g,\eta) &= 2\kappa^{1/4} g_{bj}\delta^a_k\delta^i_c - \kappa^{1/4} g^{ai} g_{bj} g_{ck}, \\ N^{ai}{}_{bc}(g,\eta) &= \frac{1}{\kappa}\kappa^{1/4}\delta^a_b\delta^i_c - \frac{1}{2\kappa}\kappa^{1/4} g^{ai} g_{bc}, \\ O(g,\eta) &= -\frac{1}{8\kappa^2}\kappa^{1/4}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

With this at hand, we can check that the leading order (2.17) is exactly (2.6). This means that the nonlinear action (2.15) is a valid theory of a self-interacting helicity ± 2 graviton, as it satisfies the iterative equations (2.9) and has the desired non-interacting limit.

From this result one can conclude that there is no distinction from the perspective of self-coupling between general relativity and the theory presented here. Both nonlinear theories lead to the kind of particle one expects to mediate the gravitational interaction in the non-interacting limit and can be explicitly constructed by self-coupling this particle. The only distinction between them is their internal symmetry group. In previous analyses such as [7, 8] it was always implicitly assumed that the gauge symmetry characteristic of a helicity ± 2 graviton is that of Fierz-Pauli theory. For example in Appendix B of [8], which is nowadays considered as the definite reference as far as the uniqueness of the construction leading to general relativity is concerned, the gauge transformations of Fierz-Pauli theory are extensively used. If one accepts this internal symmetry structure, then general relativity is the only consistent nonlinear theory one would find which preserves the notion of gauge invariance [9]. Nevertheless, this is an assumption which is not necessary from the perspective of special relativistic field theory and, moreover, it is ultimately motivated by the knowledge of the symmetry group of general relativity. Summarizing, the alternative we consider here is as sensible as general relativity and, as we will see, may even be more natural as a quantum theory.

To complete our program we need to consider the inclusion of matter. The integration of the matter part of the iterative equations is straightforward, although the result is not unique. But we can appeal to two principles to resolve its non-uniqueness. The first one is the quantum version of the equivalence principle shown as a consequence of Poincaré invariance in [5]: the coupling of the field which describes gravity to matter and to itself must be governed by the same coupling constant λ. The second principle rests in the observation that conformal invariance is not a symmetry of matter in our world. A safe way to proceed is then to consider that matter fields are not affected by the conformal transformations (2.14) (in the language of [19], matter fields are inert under conformal transformations). Both principles imply that the resulting action of matter is obtained by replacing η_{ab} with the composite field $\hat{g}_{ab}$. Non-minimal couplings to $\hat{g}_{ab}$ are allowed by construction. Notice that no constraints are imposed on the matter sector.

3 A low-energy solution to the cosmological constant problem

When expressed in terms of the composite variable $\hat{g}_{ab}$, the nonlinear theory of gravity we are considering here has the form of general relativity plus matter, but it is a theory formulated in flat spacetime and the determinant of the metric is fixed by $\det(\hat{g}) = \det(\eta)$. On these grounds it can be understood as an extension of unimodular gravity which is invariant under general coordinate transformations. It is well-known that in unimodular gravity vacuum zero-point energies of matter do not gravitate. Here this is also true: by the condition on the determinant, the corresponding (regulated) contribution in the effective action would have the form

$$\int \mathrm{d}\mathscr{V} E_{\mathrm{vac}}. \tag{3.1}$$

These energies act as a mere constant shift in the effective action, as we are used to in any special relativistic quantum field theory which does not contain gravity. Technically, the contributions of vacuum bubbles cancel out of correlation functions as a result of the linked-cluster theorem. This does not happen when considering general relativity (as an effective quantum field theory [20]) instead, leading to the cosmological constant problem [2, 3].

The contributions of vacuum bubbles are divergent even in finite-dimensional quantum mechanics [3]. However, as in quantum field theory without gravity, these contributions are always factored out in the evaluation of correlation functions. Only connected diagrams have physical significance in the perturbative expansion. For these reasons vacuum bubbles are pathological in nature, although the consideration of general relativity opened this Pandora's box. It is suggestive to think that, in a world in which general relativity had not been discovered yet, the most instinctive option for those accustomed to quantum field theory would be to ensure that this cancellation of vacuum bubbles still holds when a massles helicity ± 2 particle is included. This consideration would lead directly to the nonlinear theory with action (2.15), excluding general relativity as a viable special relativistic field theory of gravity.[3]

One could expect that deviating from the usual solution to the self-coupling problem would incur in disagreement with experimental facts. On the contrary, the theory constructed here indeed describes gravity in a way which is compatible with all the known experiments in gravitation. The field equations are, by construction, traceless. In particular, in the gauge $\det(g) = \det(\eta)$ they reduce to the trace-free Einstein equations:

$$R_{ab} - \frac{1}{4} R g_{ab} = \lambda^2 \left(T_{ab} - \frac{1}{4} T g_{ab} \right). \tag{3.2}$$

To remark again the main point, vacuum zero-point energies automatically drop off from the field equations. These are tensorial with respect to changes of coordinates regardless of the fact that the metric is constrained, as it is a tensorial constraint, $\det(g) = \det(\eta)$. This is different from the strict formulation of unimodular gravity in which active and

[3] For the sake of being exhaustive one could study the possibility that vacuum bubbles have physical effects when gravity is included *i.e.* consider general relativity. Confrontation with experiments would lead then to the cosmological constant problem, ruling out this possibility.

passive diffeomorphisms are merged and the metric is subjected to a non-tensorial condition $\det(g) = 1$.

Given the fact that the canonical stress-energy tensor of gravity and matter is conserved under solutions [18], we recover the Einstein field equations with a phenomenological integration constant, unrelated to zero-point energies of matter, playing the role of a cosmological constant; this is shown in Sec. VI-A of [9]. This effective cosmological constant is not renormalized by radiative corrections. The resulting field equations include potential energies in the matter sector as, even if gravity is not directly coupled to these terms by construction, they inevitably appear in the definition of the canonical stress-energy tensor. Although this is similar to what happens in unimodular gravity [21, 22] (and previous constructions of Weyl transverse gravity [23]), here it is consequence of Poincaré invariance and not the result of a separate assumption as in the latter case. In other words, in this setting the covariant conservation of the matter stress-energy tensor is not an imposition but the result of the global symmetries of the system, corollary which we certainly find appealing.

All the solutions of the Einstein field equations with arbitrary values of the cosmological constant are imported to this theory. For example, the Schwarzschild solution in Painlevé-Gullstrand coordinates would represent the classical gravitational field of a pointlike matter source. In other words, the space of solutions of the theory with action (2.15) is equivalent to that of a set of Einstein-Hilbert actions covering all possible values of the cosmological constant. The analogy with a massive free particle due to Weinberg [1] is rather illuminating of the situation: within this analogy, general relativity would correspond with the standard theory with fixed mass parameter m while, in the case of the theory presented here, an arbitrary integration constant would play the role of the mass occuring in the mass-shell relation. This subtle difference, together with the rather different conceptual content and structure of both theories, should be taken into account when looking for a theory of quantum gravity.

In fact, considering the theory given by the action (2.15) as the low-energy theory of a would-be theory of quantum gravity automatically solves the cosmological constant problem. A solution along these lines (*i.e.* through a modification of the low-energy effective theory of gravity) was first proposed in [21], considering unimodular gravity instead, and in [24]. The novelty here is that, by construction, it is likely that any ultraviolet completion of gravity which makes strong use of Poincaré invariance such as string theory or emergent gravity approaches can acommodate the theory discussed here as its long-wavelength limit. Our analysis shows that there is no reason, either theoretical or experimental, to insist that the low-energy limit of a theory of emergent gravity is described by the structure of general relativity. The situation is, indeed, the opposite.

4 Summary

In this work we have revisited the problem of the self-coupling of a helicity ± 2 graviton. We have remarked that there exists a solution to the problem which is not structurally equivalent to general relativity, contrary to conventional wisdom. Previous analyses failed

to find it because of being biased by the knowledge of the geometric theory of gravity. We have given some arguments that show that it would represent indeed the intuitive answer, instead of general relativity, in a true bottom-up attempt to solve the self-coupling problem. In the alternative theory of gravity there is no room for the vacuum zero-point energies to gravitate, while the rest of classic predictions of general relativity are preserved: the quantum-mechanical view of the gravitational interaction as mediated by a helicity ± 2 graviton seems to capture the phenomenology of our Universe a step beyond of what general relativity does. These realizations make this alternative worth exploring as a candidate to describe the low-energy limit of a would-be theory of quantum gravity.

Acknowledgments

Financial support was provided by the Spanish MICINN through Projects No. FIS2011-30145-C03-01 and FIS2011-30145-C03-02 (with FEDER contribution), and by the Junta de Andalucía through Project No. FQM219. R. C-R. acknowledges support from CSIC through the JAE-predoc program, cofunded by FSE.

References

[1] Steven Weinberg. The cosmological constant problem. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 61:1–23, Jan 1989.

[2] C. P. Burgess. The Cosmological Constant Problem: Why it's hard to get Dark Energy from Micro-physics. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2013.

[3] J. Martin. Everything you always wanted to know about the cosmological constant problem (but were afraid to ask). *Comptes Rendus Physique*, 13:566–665, July 2012.

[4] S. Carlip. Challenges for emergent gravity. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, (0):–, 2013.

[5] S. Weinberg. Photons and Gravitons in S-Matrix Theory: Derivation of Charge Conservation and Equality of Gravitational and Inertial Mass. *Physical Review*, 135:1049–1056, August 1964.

[6] E. Álvarez, D. Blas, J. Garriga, and E. Verdaguer. Transverse Fierz Pauli symmetry. *Nuclear Physics B*, 756:148–170, November 2006.

[7] S. Deser. Self-interaction and gauge invariance. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 1:9–18, March 1970.

[8] D. G. Boulware and S. Deser. Classical general relativity derived from quantum gravity. *Annals of Physics*, 89:193–240, January 1975.

[9] Carlos Barceló, Raúl Carballo-Rubio, and Luis J. Garay. Unimodular gravity and general relativity from graviton self-interactions. *Phys.Rev.*, D89:124019, 2014.

[10] D. Blas. Gauge symmetry and consistent spin-2 theories. *Journal of Physics A Mathematical General*, 40:6965–6971, June 2007.

[11] C.W. Misner, K.S. Thorne, and J.A. Wheeler. *Gravitation*. Number pt. 3 in Gravitation. W. H. Freeman, 1973.

[12] E. Wigner. On unitary representations of the inhomogeneous lorentz group. *Annals of Mathematics*, 40(1):pp. 149–204, 1939.

[13] T. Ortín. *Gravity and Strings*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[14] B. Zwiebach. *A First Course in String Theory*. A First Course in String Theory. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[15] V. I. Ogievetsky and I. V. Polubarinov. Interacting field of spin 2 and the einstein equations. *Annals of Physics*, 35:167–208, November 1965.

[16] S. N. Gupta. Gravitation and Electromagnetism. *Physical Review*, 96:1683–1685, December 1954.

[17] L. M. Butcher, M. Hobson, and A. Lasenby. Bootstrapping gravity: A consistent approach to energy-momentum self-coupling. *Physical Review D*, 80(8):084014, October 2009.

[18] N. Rosen. General relativity and flat space. i. *Phys. Rev.*, 57:147–150, Jan 1940.

[19] Enrique Alvarez and Roberto Vidal. Weyl transverse gravity (WTDiff) and the cosmological constant. *Phys.Rev.*, D81:084057, 2010.

[20] C. P. Burgess. Quantum Gravity in Everyday Life: General Relativity as an Effective Field Theory. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 7:5, April 2004.

[21] G. F. R. Ellis, H. van Elst, J. Murugan, and J.-P. Uzan. On the trace-free Einstein equations as a viable alternative to general relativity. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 28(22):225007, November 2011.

[22] George F R Ellis. The Trace-Free Einstein Equations and inflation. *Gen.Rel.Grav.*, 46:1619, 2014.

[23] Enrique Alvarez. The Weight of matter. *JCAP*, 1207:002, 2012.

[24] T. Padmanabhan. General relativity from a thermodynamic perspective. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 46:1673, March 2014.